DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 634 HE 002 621

TITLE	A Preliminary Report on the Status of Women at Princeton University.
INSTITUTION	National Organization for Women, Princeton. Central New Jersey Chapter.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Additional copies may be obtained from Academic Task Force, NOW, PO Box 2163, Princeton, New Jersey 08540
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Employment Patterns; Females; Feminism; Higher Education; Social Discrimination; Students; Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	National Organization for Women; *Princeton University

ABSTRACT

Women are under-represented at all levels of the Princeton faculty (3.27%) and are most noticeably absent from the highest levels. Fifty-five percent of the men and 11.5% of the women are in the top two professorial ranks. Eighty percent of the men, in contrast to 40% of the women, hold regular faculty positions. The "visiting" faculty title was found to have a different, "inferior" meaning for women. Fourteen departments and two schools have no females on their regular teaching staffs; no women are to be found on the faculty in any of the natural sciences, mathematics, or in engineering and applied science, despite the numbers of women earning PhD's in these fields annually. One-quarter of the administrative staff are women, yet there are no women in the three highest ranks, and 65% are in the lowest rank. The rank which is a first step for men is given to women after long and faithful service. There is a strong tendency toward segregated male and female job classifications, with the women's jobs receiving lower pay, despite the fact that some require greater skills. The University is asked to take positive steps with regard to these matters. The history and philosophy of co-education at Princeton is reviewed. Data appear in tables accompanying the text. (LR)

ED0 566634

A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON

THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Issued by

The Task Force on Equal Academic Opportunities
of the
Central New Jersey Chapter of the National Organization for Women

April 1971

HE002621

For additional copies please write:
Academic Task Force, NOW - P.O. Box 2163 - Princeton NJ - 08540

25¢

September 1971

To All Women at Princeton:

It will not be easy to eradicate the patterns of discrimination and prejudice which prevail at Princeton -- patterns which keep women underrepresented and underpaid; which lead to female job-seekers being subjected to questions about their sex lives, child rearing practices and family budgets which no man would (or would have to) tolerate; which inspire such comments as "What does a pretty girl like you want with a PhD, a career?" or "Of course he needs to be paid more; you have (or will have, or should have) a man to support you."; which underlie the widespread assumption that typing skills are a female secondary sex characteristic; which generate such "friendly" advice as "You should begin as a secretary if you want to 'succeed'" (typing the ideas and furthering the career of the male who last year was your classmate, and apparently your "equal", or supporting the husband who will begin to look upon you as dull as his horizons widen and your world narrows).

When we first issued this report in April 1971, we hoped for some positive response from the men who run the University. We received none. They denied that any discrimination against women exists at Princeton. We know that this is not true.

Subsequently we filed a formal complaint with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, charging the University with discrimination against women and requesting that this discrimination be eliminated or Princeton be barred from receiving Federal contracts.

This fall, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will send agents to investigate our charge of discrimination. It will be up to the women at the University to provide the HEW investigators with the evidence they will need in order to evaluate and remedy the situation.

For too many years, we have submitted to injustice because we have felt powerless to fight it. Injustice has fed upon our silence. Now is the time to speak up for ourselves and for all women. If you have suffered any discrimination at Princeton because you are a woman, or if you believe that you may be receiving unequal treatment in any way,or if you know of another woman who has been dealt with unfairly, we urge you to speak up loudly and frankly to the HEW investigators during their visit.

If you feel unwilling or unready to contact them directly, please call or write us and tell us of your experience and we will do everything that we can to help you while keeping your identity strictly confidential.

Yours toward sisterhood and justice,

The Women of the Academic Task Force
of Central New Jersey NOW*

....

Contact us by writing to P. O. Box 2163, Princeton, N.J. 08540, or calling Ellen Morgan at 799-1160.

*The National Organization for Women is a civil rights organization working to establish equal rights for women.

The Central New Jersey Chapter is actively working for women in such areas as employment, education, abortion and health care, media and text book image. We also have consciousness raising groups and groups which come together informally for specific actions. If you want to know more about us and/or join us in action, call our chapter coordinator, Nancy Browder, at 924-7497, or write us at P. O. Box 2163. (Ask for a free copy of our Newsletter.)

CONTENTS

I.	Faculty	1
II.	Administration	5
III.	Other Staff	6
IV.	Students	11
V.	Conclusions and Suggestions for the Future	16
	Notes	19

Unless the University, its trustees, its faculty and its students are ready to give continuous and serious concern and effort to what it can offer women for their intellectual growth and development; unless we are willing to accept as desirable that women will demand a quality of education in no way inferior to that offered men; unless we are prepared to acknowledge that the restricted roles of women in the past are outmoded, and the intellectual talents of women are "an important personal and public resource to be developed and used with care and courage"; unless we can embrace all of these things, Princeton should abandon all thought of admitting women. In our opinion, this point cannot be stressed too much.

-- Professor Gardner Patterson, 1968

I. FACULTY

Women are under-represented at all levels of the Princeton faculty and are most noticeably absent from the highest levels. Of the 699 Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Instructors pictured and listed in The Princeton University Faculty 1970-1971 (a handbook published by the University), only 26 (or 3.27%) are women. Of the 673 male faculty members listed, 371 (over 55%) are in the two top Professorial ranks. In the same ranks, we find three (11.5%) of the 26 females. (See Table 1.)

Table 1.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY FACULTY BY SEX AND RANK

Rank	Total	Male	Female	Percent Male	Percent Female	Percent of Males*	Percent of Females*
Professor	274	272	2	99.27	.73	40.42	7.69
Associate Professor	100	99	1	99.00	1.00	14.71	3.85
Assistant Professor	175	167	8	95.43	4.57	24.81	30.77
Lecturer	86	78	8	90.70	9.30	11.59	30.77
Instructor	45	39	6	86.67	13.33	5.79	23.08
Lecturer with the rank of Professor	11	11	0	100.00	0.00	1.63	0.00
Lecturer w. rank of Associate Professor	6	5	1	83.33	16.67	0.74	3.85
Lecturer w. rank of Assistant Professor	2	2	0	100.00	0.00	0.30	0.00
Totals	699	673	26			99.99	100.01

*The percentage of all males (or females) on the faculty who hold this rank.
(Source: The Princeton University Faculty 1970-1971.)

A full 99.27% of the Professors, 99% of the Associate Professors, and 95.43% of the Assistant Professors at Princeton are men. Almost 80% of the

men on the faculty, but only about 40% of the women, hold one of these three ranks. About 20% of the men, and 58% of the women, hold the relatively "exceptional" ranks of Lecturer or Instructor--untenured positions to which appointments are normally made for only one year. Thus, the few women on the Princeton faculty are disproportionately represented at the lowest ranks.

Princeton's individual Departments and Schools have a great deal of independence in the selection of their staffs, and one would expect the distribution of women among these units to be, in part, a reflection of the attitudes and practices concerning women which prevail within the separate Departments and Schools. Table 2 indicates the numbers of male and female faculty members for each of these units.

Table 2 also indicates the number of "Visiting" staff members. Generally, "Visiting" seems to have one of two meanings: 1) The staff member is actually affiliated with another institution and is at Princeton part-time or while on leave from his "home" institution, or 2) The staff member is not affiliated elsewhere, but is employed at Princeton only on a short-term contract (usually one or two semesters). An informal survey indicates that "Visiting" men tend to fall into the first category, women into the second.

Fourteen Departments and two Schools at Princeton have no females on their "regular" (non-"visiting") teaching staffs: Anthropology, Astrophysical Sciences, Biochemical Sciences, Biology, Chemistry, Classics,

---

Notes relating to Table 2 (page 3):

*"Regular" faculty includes teaching personnel not listed as affiliated elsewhere--excluding "Visiting" staff.

**The Woodrow Wilson School is exceptional in that only ten of its 60 "regular" staff members are affiliated exclusively with the School.

***The discrepancy between the totals in Tables 1 and 2 is apparently due to several men being listed as members of more than one Department in the Catalogue.

Table 2.

THE FACULTIES OF PRINCETON'S DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS 1970-1971

Department or School	"Regular"* Total	Male	Female	"Visiting" Male	Female
Anthropology	7	7	0	0	1
Art & Archaeology	16	15	1	4	0
Astrophysical Sciences	21	21	0	1	0
Biochemical Sciences	13	13	0	1	0
Biology	24	24	0	1	0
Chemistry	26	26	0	5	0
Classics	14	14	0	4	0
East Asian Studies	17	14	3	1	0
Economics	39	38	1	0	0
English	42	40	2	1	0
Geological & Geophysical Sciences	18	18	0	3	0
Germanic Languages & Literatures	13	13	0	0	0
History	43	41	2	2	0
Mathematics	47	47	0	5	0
Music	14	14	0	1	0
Near Eastern Studies	11	9	2	4	0
Philosophy	22	21	1	6	0
Physics	58	58	0	4	0
Politics	35	33	2	1	0
Psychology	26	26	0	2	1
Religion	13	13	0	2	0
Romance Languages & Literatures	28	23	5	0	0
Slavic Languages & Literatures	10	6	4	2	1
Sociology	22	20	2	3	2
Statistics	7	7	0	7	0
School of Architecture & Urban Planning	21	20	1	8	0
School of Engineering & Applied Science	99	99	0	12	0
Woodrow Wilson School**	10	10	0	3	0
Totals***	716	690	26	83	5

(Source: Official Register of Princeton University: General Catalogue 1970-71.)

Geological and Geophysical Sciences, Germanic Languages and Literatures, Mathematics, Music, Physics, Psychology, Religion, Statistics, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Woodrow Wilson School (or that portion of the Wilson School staff which is not affiliated elsewhere).

No women are to be found on the faculty in any of the Natural Sciences, Mathematics, or in Engineering and Applied Science. The School of Engineering, for example, has a total of 111 regular and visiting staff members, all male. Perhaps even more surprising is the absence of any women faculty members in the social sciences and humanities listed above. It is probable that fully qualified women could be found in any of the fields listed. Table 3 gives some basis upon which to estimate the pools of qualified women for eight of these areas.

Table 3.

PERCENTAGE OF DOCTORATES AWARDED TO WOMEN IN SELECTED FIELDS IN 1967-1968

Anthropology	23.9%	German	23.9%
Biochemistry	22.3%	Mathematics	6.0%
General Biology	29.0%	Music	14.5%
Chemistry	8.0%	Psychology	22.5%

(Source: Earned Degrees Conferred, Office of Education, OE-54013-68-A.)

Three Departments and one School at Princeton have one female "regular" faculty member each: Art and Archaeology, Economics, Philosophy, and the School of Architecture and Urban Planning. Five Departments have two women each: English, History, Near Eastern Studies, Politics, and Sociology. One Department, East Asian Studies, has three women. One, Slavic Languages and Literatures, has four. One, Romance Languages and Literatures, has five.

At first glance, these last two Departments would seem to have taken a

step beyond tokenism in the integration of women into the faculty. However, a second look casts some doubt upon this interpretation. In Slavic Languages and Literatures, all four of the women are Lecturers, and there are no male Lecturers and no Instructors of either sex in the Department. Princeton's recent decision to eliminate its graduate program in Slavic makes the future of these women (over 15% of the total women on the faculty) very uncertain. The Administration has said that it will not terminate any tenured Department members, but Lecturers do not have continuing tenure. Romance Languages and Literatures has one female Assistant Professor, but the other four women in the Department are Instructors--the lowest rung on the hierarchical ladder and a potentially terminal position.

II. ADMINISTRATION

As of the beginning of this year (fiscal 1971) about one-quarter of the approximately 300 people in Princeton's Administration were women. About 65% of these women were Administrative Assistants, the lowest rank in the Administration (with an annual salary range of $7,000-$10,800). Most of the remainder were Administrative Associates ($8,700-$13,300). Only four women were Administrative Officers ($10,800-$16,600). There were no women in the three highest ranks of the Administration: Senior Administrative Officer ($13,000-$19,900), University Officer ($16,500-$24,800), and Senior University Officer ($20,600 and up). The General Catalogue 1970-1971 lists 21 "Officers of the University," all men.

There is an impression, shared by a significant number of women doing administrative work, that women are often paid less (and may be officially classified at lower ranks) than men doing substantially similar work, and that women must be relatively better qualified than men in order to obtain promotion or salary

increases. There is also an impression that the rank of Administrative Assistant--seemingly the logical first step in a career in administrative work--is often a terminal position for women, who are given this rank at the end of their careers as a "reward for long and faithful service" to the University as Office personnel. This is not the place to prove or disprove such allegations; perhaps it is enough to say that these impressions are so widespread that they should either be proved or disproved.

III. OTHER STAFF

Princeton employes between 2,000 and 2,500 non-teaching personnel, of whom about 40% are female. In only one staff division, "Food Service" workers, does the percentage of women employed bear a close relationship to the percentage of women in the total Princeton University work force. "Office Staff" (over 95% female) and "Library Staff" (about 90% female) appear to be rather firmly classified as "women's work." "Laboratory and Shop Staff" (over 85% male) and "Maintenance and Service Staff" (nearly 100% male) are job categories primarily filled with men. Thus--while there may or may not be cases in which men and women are paid different salaries for doing the same job--in most cases men and women are not hired to do the same jobs at Princeton.

There are separate salary schedules for the various job classifications, and there is a clear possibility that inequitable salaries are offered for "men's" and "women's" jobs requiring similar amounts of skill and effort. Certainly, there are significant differences in the salary ranges between different categories. For example, current annual salaries for Office personnel (mostly women) range from $4.004 to $8,502.[1] Annual salaries for Laboratory and Shop personnel (mostly men) range from $4,394 to $10,894 (leaving aside those jobs for which no upper salary limit is drawn).[2]

A comparison of the annual salary rates of the eleven females employed as Office Staff in one Department to those of the ten males employed as Laboratory and Shop Staff in the same Department is of some interest in this connection. Comparing the means of the two groups, we find that, as of December 1970, the women had worked for the University for an average of four years, the men for an average of 4.1 years. The mean annual salary of the women was $5,562; that of the men, $6,521. Thus, on the average, the men were making $959 (or over 17%) more than the women. If medians are compared, the women had worked for an average of 3 years, the men for 2.5. The median salary of the women was $5,304; that of the men, $6,461. Thus, the median salary of the men was $1,157 (or almost 22%) more than that of the women. If the Lab and Shop workers had been limited to a 36¼ hour week (as the Office workers were), their mean salary would still have been about $348 (or over 6%) more than that of the women; their median salary, about $551 (or over 9%) greater than the women's.

Table 4 indicates the annual salary rates of several categories of workers presently employed in another Department:

Table 4.

ANNUAL SALARY RATES IN DEPARTMENT "Y" AS OF MARCH 1971

	Men	Women
Mean Salary, Laboratory and Technical Workers	$ 6,949	$ 6,650
Median Salary, Laboratory and Technical Workers	7,072	6,752
Mean Salary, Secretarial Workers	---	5,550
Median Salary, Secretarial Workers	---	5,304
Mean Salary, "Professional" Workers	11,229	8,293
Median Salary, "Professional" Workers	8,700	8,400

There are 34 employees in Department Y, 20 women and 14 men. Five of the women and two of the men are employed on a part-time basis. (Throughout this section, means and medians have been computed by using the annual salary "base" for part-time workers, that is, the amount they would be earning if they were employed full-time.) Six women and seven men are employed as laboratory and technical personnel. The mean annual salary of the men is $299 (or nearly 5%) more than that of the women. The men's median annual salary is $320 (again, nearly 5%) more than the women's. Whether by intent or by accident, jobs of this category in Department Y are allotted on the basis of sex. The women are all laboratory technicians; the laboratory technicians are all women. The men hold a variety of positions, including greenhouse worker, animal caretaker, maintenance worker, and stock room keeper.

Animal caretakers receive relatively low salaries, yet every male employee in this Department earns more than the mean salary ($5,55[illegible]) of the seven secretarial workers in the Department (all of whom are female). It is questionable whether the amount of skill and effort needed to feed and water animals is sufficiently greater than the amount required to perform secretarial duties to justify any such difference in pay.

Department Y also has a staff of seven male and seven female "professionals"--holders of doctorates and people in high skill areas. The difference between the mean salaries of the men and women in this group is $2,936 (over 35%), and the difference between their median salaries is $300 (almost 4%). Either way, the men are making more money than the women.

A job by job, person by person comparison, using the case history method, cannot be carried out in this report. However, it should be noted

that it is not clear that greater skill or experience is required for entry into the male-dominated Laboratory and Shop category than for entry into the relatively lower-paying female-dominated Office category. In fact, the reverse may be true. For example, in order to become a "Trainee Technician" (a Lab and Shop position), one need have only a high school education, or its equivalent, and a strong interest or aptitude in the skill to be performed. The current minimum salary for a "Trainee Technician" is $4,888 annually, with an "automatic increase to $5,200 after 6 months satisfactory service." The skills required to become a "Typist 'A'" (an Office position) include typing speed and accuracy, and judgement in the setting up of materials and/or knowledge of difficult terminology. The applicant must be able to deal with statistical tabulations, foreign languages, specialized terminology, formulae, and bibliographical tables. The current minimum salary for a "Typist 'A'" is $4,420, with no "automatic increase" guaranteed. Thus, the relatively skilled "Typist 'A'" receives, from the start, lower pay per hour than the unskilled "Trainee Technician."

On 8 March 1971, new "Position Classification and Salary Structure" schedules--to become effective 1 July 1971--were issued by the Office of Personnel Services. There were salary increases in all job categories, but inequities between "men's" and "women's" areas do not seem to have been eliminated. Indeed, in some instances, they seem to have become greater. For example, the minimum salary of an "Animal Caretaker" is presently almost 4% more than that of a "Departmental Secretary" (a higher position than a "Typist 'A'"). As of 1 July, it will be almost 6% more.

On the newly issued schedules, the salaries for Office and Library staff range from $4,160 to $9,022; the salaries for Laboratory and Shop staff

range from $4,654 to $11,102 (excluding "Senior Staff," for whom no upper salary limit is indicated). On these schdules (as on the current ones) Office and Library salaries are based on a 36¼ hour week, while Laboratory and Shop salaries are based on a 40 hour week. Thus, even were all hourly wage inequities eliminated, the annual Office and Library salaries would still be depressed by approximately 10% in relation to Laboratory and Shop salaries.

The justification for limiting jobs in "women's" areas to a 36¼ hour week, while basing jobs in "men's" areas on the standard 40 hour week, is not clear. This practice would seem to proceed, in part, from the assumption--widely held in this society--that men must earn a "living wage,' but women work "just for pin money" or out of boredom. This assumption of differences between the motives and needs of working men and women has been refuted by the U.S. Department of Labor's studies on working women.

Of all working women, 42% are working to support themselves or their (husbandless) families. Of the rest who are married, six in ten are members of families which would have incomes of less than $7,000 without their earnings. Many of the women employed by Princeton are working to put their husbands through school, and must work in Princeton because that is where their husbands are. Like most other women (and men), they need full-time jobs, and they "need the purchasing power as well as the satisfaction of a wage which matches their contribution on the job."[3]

It has been noted that women seem, on the whole, to be confined to certain types of work at Princeton, and that they seem to be paid less generally than male employees. Promotion practices concerning women also may be inequitable. There is some evidence that there are ceilings beyond which women

are rarely promoted or hired, even in "women's" fields--the top jobs being reserved for men. For example, about 90% of the "non-professional" Library staff members are women, but of the nine top University Librarians only one (the Assistant University Librarian for Preparations) is a woman.[4]

IV. STUDENTS

For several years before coeducation was introduced, Princeton had allowed a limited number of women to pursue their graduate training at the University, and a very small number to participate in selected undergraduate courses. However, Princeton's "real commitment" to the education of women may be said to have begun in 1969, when the University began accepting women for undergraduate training leading to the baccalaureate.

When the Trustees of Princeton first approved the plans for undergraduate coeducation, they adopted the concept of "A single institution, with an established ratio of women to men students, but with no separate residential college."[5] The objective of the University, as originally formulated and recently reaffirmed, is to have "'at least 1,000 women' eventually in Princeton." while "maintaining the number of men undergraduates at about the present level of 3,200."[6] Thus Princeton plans "eventually" to achieve a male-female ratio of a little over 3 to 1 ("at least").

Before this "established ratio" was decided upon, the alternative of "admitting women in very small numbers" (enough to make up only 3 to 4% of the student body) had been examined, and had been found by some to be "attractive because it would accomplish at relatively small cost the important objective of removing any stigma that may come to be attached to Princeton in the future resulting from its discriminatory admissions practice."[7]

Ultimately Princeton seems to have concluded that conscious tokenism would not be a sound defense against charges of discrimination, but that a quota system which limited females (51% of the population) to 25% of the student body would be equitable.

During 1969-1970, 169 of the 3,427 undergraduates were women, giving a male-female ratio of over 19 to 1. As of September 1970, the predicted figures for 1970-71 were for 3,698 undergraduates, including 429 women, yielding a male-female ratio of almost 8 to 1. The "interim total" of women undergraduates planned by 1973-1974 is 650. As of November 1970, it seemed "possible" that about 800 women might be enrolled by fall 1973. Thus, Princeton hopes to attain a male-female ratio of 4 or 5 to 1 during the fifth year of coeducation.[8]

The primary reason cited by the University for not increasing the number of women more rapidly--by sharing rather than expanding its present facilities--is that it promised that it would not do so.[9]

A second reason put forth is that the substitution of women for some of the men at Princeton would have an adverse effect on the University's operating budget. The stated assumption upon which this reason is based is that the differences in course elections between men and women are significant and predictable.[10] There are a number of things wrong with making this assumption, only two of which will be mentioned here.

The first problem is that the predictions are bound to be imprecise, and may be very imprecise. When Princeton's entering freshmen were asked in fall 1970 to indicate their "probable major field of study," there were some percentage differences between the male and female responses; but these differences were not necessarily of the size and sort predicted. For example,

a much greater percentage of women (6.7) than of men (3.9) expressed interest in the Biological Sciences. Again, while only 6.1% of the men cited Mathematics or Statistics as their choice, 12% of the women chose these fields--calling forth this marginal comment in the Princeton Alumni Weekly: "It was expected that women at Princeton would revive the fine arts departments; no one expected that this many would have a yearning for calculus."[11] Apparently, it is not even possible to predict reliably the non-scholarly interests of females as opposed to males. As the Alumni Weekly noted in another issue, "Even the new modern dance course, established especially for women, has found a kind of reverse integration: it now enrolls 50 men and only 10 girls." (Emphasis added.)[12]

Secondly, such assumptions, even though incorrect in the sense of predicting the free choices of students, are likely to serve to some extent as self-fulfilling prophecies, reinforcing prevalent sex stereotypes. The "unexpected" academic choices cited above were those of entering freshman women. Whether or not these will be their final choices depends in part upon the feedback these women receive from others at the University. If it were "authoritatively" predicted, for example, that no females would major in Engineering, then any female who expressed her intention of doing so would be liable to be looked upon as "odd" because unexpected. Being viewed as an oddity would almost undoubtedly cause her to reconsider her choice and--unless she were very determined indeed--might well cause her to choose some other field the University viewed as more "feminine."

A third reason offered--for not (temporarily) reducing the number of men in order to increase the number of women--is that, regardless of the progress of coeducation, Princeton should gradually increase in size. And, since it is

anticipated that 3,200 men will be included in the enlarged student body, this number of men should be maintained throughout the growth period.[13] Separated from the issue of predicted budgetary dislocations--which has already proven to be a very murky issue indeed--this would seem to be a value judgment rather than a reason. One might with similar logic say that since Princeton ultimately plans to have at least 1,000 women, it should have admitted at least 1,000 in 1969.

Whatever the rationale, Princeton presently has--and intends in the future to have--a quota system which inequitably limits the number of women admitted, no matter how many apply and no matter how highly qualified the applicants are. The figures in Table 5 reflect this fact.

Table 5.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS - CLASS OF 1974

Sex	Number Applied	Number Admitted	Percent Admitted	Number Entering	Percent Entering	Percent of Class
Male	6328	1404	22.19	813	57.91	82.04
Female	2054	288	14.02	178	61.81	17.96
Total	8382	1692		991		100.00

(Source: Princeton Alumni Weekly, 13 October 1970, p. 4.)

About 20% of those who applied to enter Princeton in fall 1970 were accepted. More than 22% of the male applicants were accepted, but only about 14% of the female applicants. Had more women applied, the percentage of female applicants accepted would have been smaller. That the females who actually entered Princeton's Class of 1974 were more highly qualified academically than their male classmates is indicated by the results of a survey conducted by the American Council on Education. According to that

survey, 97% of the entering women had high school grade averages of B+ or above. The same was true of only 86.5% of the men. None of the female respondents reported an average below a B. Four and two-tenths percent of the males did. As the Alumni Weekly concluded from this and other data in the report, "On the whole, Princeton's women are smarter than the men...."[14] One might also conclude that some of the women who were not admitted were "smarter" than some of the men who were.

It should be noted that the effects of Princeton's admissions policies spread far beyond the years any particular female might spend as a student. For anyone who desires to pursue an academic or professional career, admission to college is analogous to admission to the "apprenticeship" programs of industry. Thus, by denying women an equal opportunity to enter as students, Princeton inequitably limits their future career choices.

Once at Princeton, those female students fortunate enough to have been admitted must face a near total lack of adequate role models--of talented and successful professional women. They must also somehow rise above the strongly negative opinions of women held be some of the men who are in a position to influence their lives. Consider, for example, the publicly stated views of the University's Director of Mental Health. When asked in 1969 what he thought of the coming of coeducation, Dr. Reik replied, "Coeducation would be more healthy socially, but whether coeducation would be better academically is questionable. Women would be distracting. They still haven't come up to men intellectually. Girls tend to learn passively. For instance many women go into music, but how many women composers can you name?"[15]

It is unclear how widespread such outspoken anti-female attitudes are at Princeton. Nevertheless, Dr. Reik's continued tenure of the office of Director

of Mental Health is surely indicative of some more general lack of sensitivity within the University community.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

A bias against women at Princeton is implicit in all of the figures and remarks which have been cited in this report. Despite advances made during the past year or two, women constitute only 3.27% of the faculty, and less than 25% of the Administration. In both areas, they are disproportionately found at the lowest ranks. Among other personnel, there is a strong tendancy toward segregated male and female job classifications, with the "women's" jobs receiving lower pay based on a shorter work week. Promotion practices may also affect men and women differently. At present, women constitute less than 12%--and, if present plans are carried out, will eventually constitute only 25%--of the undergraduate student body.

The evidence has led us to conclude that prejudice and discrimination on the basis of sex are pervasive at Princeton. Whether conscious or unconscious, subtle or obvious; whether expressed by Administrators, faculty members, or others; whether minifesting itself in hiring and promotion practices. salary ranges, or admissions policies; this prejudice and discrimination have a profound and damaging effect upon the female members of the University community.

In 1968, Professor Patterson suggested that "...taking account of the social and political changes going on in our society, it would be prudent to anticipate that legislation providing federal aid to students may contain clauses which would prevent the extension of such grants to institutions practicing discrimination by sex as well as by race, creed or color."[16] In view of Section 805 of H.R. 16098, H.R. 18278, and similar pending legisla-

tion, that suggestion is certainly worthy of attention.

Moreover, Executive Order 11246, as amended in October 1968 by Executive Order 11375, presently forbids Federal Contractors (such as Princeton University) to discriminate on the basis of sex in employment or job-training programs. In addition, these Orders require Contractors to develop and implement affirmative action programs to redress the effects of past discrimination and establish equitable patterns for the future.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is presently enforcing these Orders at universities throughout the country. Several major universities, such as Harvard and the University of Michigan, have had Federal contracts withheld pending implementation of programs to eliminate sex discrimination.

It is worth noting the kinds of affirmative action which have been required by HEW at other institutions. At Michigan, for example, HEW required that the University--in order to remain eligible for Federal contracts--must, among other things: 1) Achieve salary equity in every job category; 2) Pay back wages to each female employee who has lost wages because of discriminatory treatment since 13 October 1968; 3) Achieve a ratio of female employment in academic positions at least equivalent to the ratio of qualified female applicants; 4) Increase ratios of female admissions to all Ph.D graduate programs; 5) Increase participation of women in committees involving the selection and treatment of employees; 6) Assure that female applicants for nonacademic employment are considered on the basis of their qualifications and that the concept of separate male and female job classifications is eliminated through changes in recruitment procedures; 7) Assure that all present female employees occupying nonacademic positions who have qualifications equal to or exceeding those of male employees occupying higher level

positions be given primary consideration for promotion.[17]

The University of Pennsylvania is also taking affirmative action in regard to women. In announcing the first steps toward eliminating sex discrimination, President Meyerson stated: "Our action is less because of the Federal Government pressing us, but more because of the humaneness that universities stand for. We should be concerned not just with half of humanity but with all of it."[18]

There can be no doubt that the time has come to formulate and implement affirmative action plans for Princeton. This University is generously supported by public funds, both directly and indirectly. The use of such funds to support any institution which accords women and men the sort of differential treatment which results in a male-female ratio in the undergraduate student body of (a projected) 3 to 1, in the Administrative Staff of 3 to 1, at the full Professor level of 136 to 1, in the general faculty of almost 26 to 1, in the Office Staff of about 1 to 24, and in the Maintenance and service Staff of about 124 to 1, is certainly open to challenge.

NOTES

1. Princeton University Office of Personnel Services, "Position Classification and Salary Range: Office Staff," 3 March 1970 (effective 1 July 1970).

2. Princeton University Office of Personnel Services, "Position Classification and Salary Range: Laboratory and Shop Staff," 3 March 1970 (effective 1 July 1970).

3. The Chase Manhattan Bank, Business in Brief, October 1970, p. 5.

4. Princeton University, The General Catalogue 1970-1971, p. 417.

5. Princeton's "Status Report on Planning for Coeducation at Princeton," September 1970, pp. 2-3.

6. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 34 November 1970, p. 6ff.

7. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 24 September 1968, p. 22.

8. "Status Report...", pp. 27-8.

9. Ibid. p. 14f.

10. Ibid. p. 15ff.

11. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 23 February 1971, p. 8.

12. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 29 September 1970, p.7.

13. "Status Report...", p. 18f.

14. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 23 February 1971, p. 6f.

15. The Daily Princetonian, 7 February 1969, p. 1.

16. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 24 September 1968, p. 36.

17. Science, 20 November 1970, p. 834.

18. Pennsylvania Gazette, March 1971, p. 7.